

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TASK-BASED INSTRUCTION
TO TEACH SPEAKING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' CREATIVITY**

(An Experimental Study at the Tenth Grade of SMA Pangudi Luhur
St. Vincentius Giriwoyo in the Academic Year of 2015/2016)

A THESIS

Presented as a Partial Fulfilment of Requirements for Master Degree
in English Education



By

TH. OKY ANDRIANI

S891102049

**ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT GRADUATE SCHOOL
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
SEBELAS MARET UNIVERSITY
SURAKARTA**

2016

APPROVAL

“THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TASK-BASED INSTRUCTION TO TEACH SPEAKING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS’ CREATIVITY

**(An Experimental Study at the Tenth Grade of SMA Pangudi Luhur St. Vincentius
Giriwoyo in the Academic Year of 2015/2016)”**

By

TH. OKY ANDRIANI

S891102049

This thesis has been approved by the Consultants of English Education Department
of Graduate School Teacher Training Education Faculty
Sebelas Maret University

Surakarta, 1 July 2016

Consultant I

Consultant II

Prof. Dr. Joko Nurkamto, M. Pd.
NIP. 19610124 198702 1 001

Dra. Dewi Rochsantiningsih, M.Ed., Ph.D.
NIP. 19600918 198702 2 001

Approved By
Head of English Education Department of Graduate Program
Sebelas Maret University

Dr. Ngadiso, M. Pd.
NIP. 19621231 198803 1 009

LEGITIMATION FROM THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TASK-BASED INSTRUCTION TO TEACH
SPEAKING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' CREATIVITY**

(An Experimental Study at the Tenth Grade of SMA Pangudi Luhur St. Vincentius
Giriwoyo in the Academic Year of 2015/2016)

By

TH. OKY ANDRIANI

S891102049

This thesis has been examined by the Board of Thesis Examiners English
Department, Graduate Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Sebelas
Maret University, Surakarta on:

Day : Wednesday

Date : 20 July 2016

Board of Examiners

Signature

Chairman Dr. Ngadiso, M. Pd.
NIP. 19621231 198803 1 009

.....

Secretary Dr. Abdul Asib, M. Pd.
NIP. 19520307 198003 1 005

.....

Members

Examiners 1. Prof. Dr. Joko Nurkamto, M. Pd.
NIP. 19610124 198702 1 001

.....

2. Dra. Dewi Rochsantiningsih, M.Ed., Ph.D.
NIP. 19600918 198702 2 001

.....

Dean of Faculty of Teacher Training
And Education of Sebelas Maret
University

Head of English Education
Department Graduate School
Sebelas Maret University

Prof. Dr. Joko Nurkamto, M. Pd.
NIP. 19610124 198702 1 001

Dr. Ngadiso, M. Pd.
NIP. 19621231 198803 1 009

ABSTRACT

TH. OKY ANDRIANI. S891102049. 2016. **The Effectiveness of Task-Based Instruction to Teach Speaking Viewed from Students' Creativity**. Thesis. first consultant: Prof. Dr. Joko Nurkamto, M. Pd.; second consultant: Dra. Dewi Rochsantiningsih, M.Ed., Ph.D. Study Program English Education Department of Graduate School of Sebelas Maret University.

The objectives of the research is to investigate whether: (1) TBI is more effective than CBI to teach speaking, (2) the students who have high learning creativity have better speaking competence than those who have low learning creativity, and (3) there is an interaction between teaching approaches and learning creativity to teach speaking. This research includes three variables. Two independent variables are teaching approaches: Task-Based Instruction and Content-Based Instruction, and creativity. While the dependent variable is speaking competence.

The research was conducted at the tenth grade of SMA Pangudi Luhur St.Vincentius Giriwoyo in the academic year of 2015/2016. The sample was two classes out of three. One class was used as the experimental class and the other was used as control class. The experimental class was taught using Task-Based Instruction while the control class was taught using Content-Based Instruction. To define the sample, cluster random sampling was applied. Each class was divided into two groups of which consisted of students having high creativity and those having low creativity. To obtain the data, two instruments were used: speaking test was applied to measure the students' speaking competence and creativity test was applied to measure the students' creativity. The data were then analysed using Multifactor Analysis of Variance ANOVA 2x2 and Tuckey Test. Before conducting the ANOVA test, pre-requisite test: normality and homogeneity test, were implemented.

The results of the ANOVA show that: (1) F_o between approaches, 32.19, is higher than $F_{t(0.05)}$, 4.09, and the speaking mean score of students taught using Task-Based Instruction, 82.8, is higher than the mean score of those taught using Content-Based Instruction, 73.2; therefore, it can be concluded that Task-Based Instruction is more effective than Content-Based Instruction to teach speaking; (2) F_o between groups of high and low creativity, 118.28, is higher than $F_{t(0.05)}$, 4.09, and the speaking mean score of students having high creativity, 87.2, is higher than that of students having low creativity, 68.8; therefore, it can be concluded that students having high creativity have better achievement in speaking than those having low creativity; and (3) F_o interaction, 8.05, is higher than $F_{t(0.05)}$, 4.09; therefore, it can be concluded that there is an interaction between teaching approaches and creativity. The effectiveness of teaching approaches is affected by the levels of students' creativity and TBI is appropriate for students having high creativity and CBI is appropriate for students having low creativity.

As the conclusion, Task-Based Instruction is an effective approach to teach speaking for tenth grade students. However, to support the use of Task-Based instruction, a teacher is recommended to select tasks which suit the level of students' creativity so that the effectiveness of Task-Based Instruction can affect the students' speaking competence significantly.

Keywords: speaking competence, Task-Based Instruction, Content-Based Instruction, creativity, experimental research

ABSTRAK

TH. OKY ANDRIANI. S891102049. 2016. **The Effectiveness of Task-Based Instruction to Teach Speaking Viewed from Students' Creativity**. Thesis. Pembimbing pertama: Prof. Dr. Joko Nurkamto, M. Pd.; Pembimbing kedua: Dra. Dewi Rochsantiningsih, M.Ed., Ph.D. Program Studi Pascasarjana Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas Sebelas Maret.

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk meneliti apakah: (1) TBI lebih efektif dari pada CBI untuk mengajarkan keterampilan berbicara, (2) peserta didik dengan kreativitas tinggi memiliki kemampuan berbicara lebih baik dari pada mereka yang memiliki kreativitas rendah, dan (3) ada interaksi antara pendekatan pengajaran dan kreativitas untuk mengajarkan keterampilan berbicara. Terdapat tiga variabel dalam penelitian ini: dua variabel bebas yaitu pendekatan pengajaran: Task-Based Instruction dan Content-Based Instruction, dan kreativitas dan variabel terikat yaitu kemampuan berbicara. Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk menguji dampak dua variabel bebas terhadap variabel terikat.

Penelitian ini dilaksanakan pada kelas X SMA Pangudi Luhur St. Vincentius Giriwoyo tahun pelajaran 2015/2016. Dari tiga kelas yang ada, dua diambil sebagai sampel: satu kelas sebagai kelas eksperimen dan kelas yang lain sebagai kelas kontrol. Kelas eksperimen diajar dengan Task-Based Instruction dan kelas kontrol diajar dengan Content-Based Instruction. Cluster random sampling diterapkan untuk menentukan sampel. Setiap kelas dibagi dalam dua kelompok: siswa dengan kreativitas tinggi dan siswa dengan kreativitas rendah. Dua jenis instrumen diujikan kepada siswa untuk memperoleh data kemampuan berbicara dan kreativitas. Data yang diperoleh kemudian dianalisis menggunakan Analisis Variansi, ANAVA, dan tes Tuckey. Sebelum menganalisis data dengan ANAVA, tes pra-syarat diterapkan untuk menguji normalitas dan homogenitas data.

Hasil ANAVA menunjukkan bahwa: (1) rata-rata nilai berbicara siswa yang diajar dengan Task-Based Instruction, 82.8, lebih tinggi dari pada nilai berbicara siswa yang diajar dengan Content-Based Instruction, 73.2; maka dapat disimpulkan bahwa Task-Based Instruction lebih efektif dari pada Content-Based Instruction untuk mengajarkan berbicara; (2) rata-rata nilai berbicara siswa dengan kreativitas tinggi, 87.2, lebih baik dari rata-rata nilai siswa dengan kreativitas rendah, 68.8; maka dapat disimpulkan bahwa siswa dengan kreativitas tinggi memiliki kemampuan berbicara lebih dari pada siswa dengan kreativitas rendah; dan (3) F_o interaksi, 8.05, lebih tinggi dari F_t (0.05), 4.09; maka dapat disimpulkan bahwa ada interaksi antara pendekatan pembelajaran dengan kreativitas dalam mengajarkan speaking.

Kesimpulan dari penelitian ini adalah bahwa Task-Based Instruction merupakan pendekatan pembelajaran yang efektif untuk mengajar speaking pada siswa kelas X SMA Pangudi Luhur St. Vincentius Giriwoyo. Namun, untuk mendukung penerapan Task-Based Instruction, guru disarankan untuk memilih *task* yang sesuai dengan tingkat kreativitas siswa sehingga efektivitas Task-Based Instruction dapat memengaruhi keterampilan *speaking* siswa secara signifikan.

Kata kunci: keterampilan berbicara, Task-Based Instruction, Content-Based Instruction, kreativitas, penelitian eksperimentasi

PRONOUNCEMENT

This is to declare that I, myself, write this thesis entitled “**The Effectiveness of Task-Based Instruction to Teach Speaking Viewed from Students’ Creativity:** An Experimental Study in the Tenth Grade of SMA Pangudi Luhur St. Vincentius Giriwoyo in the Academic Year of 2015/2016. It is not a plagiation or made by others. Anything related to the others’ work is written in quotation and the source of which is listed in bibliography.

If then this pronouncement proved incorrect, I am ready to accept my academic punishment including the withdrawal of my academic degree.

Surakarta, 1 July 2016

Th. Oky Andriani

MOTTO

If you're trying to achieve, there will be roadblocks. I've had them; everybody has had them. But obstacles don't have to stop you. If you run into a wall, don't turn around and give up. Figure out how to climb it, go through it, or work around it.

(Michael Jordan)

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to:

- My beloved husband, Matheus Dwi Pramono
- My little princess, Felicia Mathilda Pramono
- My super mother, Lusiana Sri Yatni
- My in-law family

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

My greatest gratitude is presented to the Almighty God, Jesus Christ, and Mother Mary for the help, health, power, and everything granted to me so I could complete this thesis. In this golden opportunity, I would like to express my gratitude to those who have helped me finishing this thesis:

1. The Dean of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education for his permission to write this thesis,
2. The Director of Graduate Program of Sebelas Maret University for his permission to write this thesis,
3. The Head of the English Education Department of Graduate program for his guidance and advice to write this thesis.
4. Prof. Dr. Joko Nurkamto, M. Pd., the First Consultant, for his patience, help, guidance, advice, and support during this thesis writing,
5. Drs. Gunarso Susilohadi, M. Ed. for his help, guidance, and advice at the initial stage of this thesis writing,
6. Dra. Dewi Rochsantiningasih, M. Ed., Ph.D., the Second Consultant, for her patience, help, guidance, advice, and support during this thesis writing,
7. The Headmaster of SMA Pangudi Luhur St. Vincentius Giriwoyo, for his permission to conduct a research,
8. The students of SMA Pangudi Luhur St. Vincentius Giriwoyo class X.1 and X.3, for their willingness to take part in this research,
9. My beloved friends and colleagues for helping accomplish the process of writing this thesis.

In order to improve similar research in the future, all supporting suggestions and beneficial criticism are openly welcomed. Finally, I hope that this thesis can be useful for others and it can improve my knowledge.

Surakarta, July 2016
Th. Oky Andriani
theresiaoky@gmail.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	i
APPROVAL SHEET BY ADVISOR	ii
LEGITIMATION FROM BOARD OF EXAMINERS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ABSTRAK	v
PRONOUNCEMENT	vi
MOTTO	vii
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
LIST OF APPENDICES	xv
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	
A. Background of the Study	1
B. Identification of the Problem	9
C. Limitation of the Problem	9
D. Statement of the Problem	10
E. Purpose of the Study	10
F. Significance of the Study	11
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	
A. Theoretical Description	14
1. The Nature of Speaking	14
a. The Definition of Speaking	14
b. What Makes Speaking Difficult	19
c. Types of Classroom Speaking Performance	21
d. Teaching Speaking	23

2. Task-Based Instruction (TBI)	25
a. Definition of Task	25
b. Concept of Task-Based Instruction (TBI)	27
c. Theory of Language	30
d. Theory of Learning	32
e. Procedures of Task-Based Instruction (TBI)	33
f. Strengths and Weaknesses of Task-Based Instruction (TBI)...	35
3. Content-Based Instruction (CBI)	37
a. Concept of Content-Based Instruction (CBI)	37
b. Theory of Language	38
c. Theory of Learning	40
d. Procedures of Content-Based Instruction (CBI)	41
e. Strengths of Content-Based Instruction	46
f. Weaknesses of Content-Based Instruction	47
4. Creativity	48
a. The Meaning of Creativity	48
b. Processes of Creativity	50
c. Levels of Creativity	51
d. Creative Person	53
e. Teaching for Creativity	58
f. Measuring Creativity	59
B. Review of Relevant Studies	61
C. Rationale	68
D. Hypotheses	72

CHAPTER III : RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Place and Time of the Research	73
B. Research Method	73
C. Population, Sample, and Sampling	75
D. Techniques of Collecting the Data	75
E. Techniques of Analyzing the Data	76

F. Statistical Hypothesis	79
 CHAPTER IV RESEARCH FINDINGS	
A. Implementation of the Research	82
B. Data Description	84
C. Prerequisite Test	93
D. Data Analyses	96
E. Discussion of Research Results	100
F. Limitation of the Research	105
 CHAPTER V CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION AND SUGGESTION	
A. Conclusion	107
B. Implication and Suggestion	109
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 115
APPENDICES	119

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	the use of language	16
Table 2.2	Phases of TBI	67
Table 3.1	the Research Activities	73
Table 3.2	Factorial Design of the Research	74
Table 3.3	Frequency Distribution Table	76
Table 3.4	Summary of a 2x2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance	78
Table 4.1	the Implementation of the Research	82
Table 4.2	Teaching Materials	83
Table 4.3	Tally of Data A_1	85
Table 4.4	Tally of Data A_2	86
Table 4.5	Tally of Data B_1	87
Table 4.6	Tally of Data B_2	88
Table 4.7	Tally of Data A_1B_1	89
Table 4.8	Tally of Data $A_2 B_1$	90
Table 4.9	Tally of Data A_1B_2	91
Table 4.10	Tally of Data A_2B_2	92
Table 4.11	The Summary of Normality Test of the Data	93
Table 4.12	Series of Data Obtained from the Research	94
Table 4.13	The Results of the Square of the Data	95
Table 4.14	Homogeneity Test	96
Table 4.15	Analyses of the Data	97
Table 4.16	Summary of ANOVA	97

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1	Histogram and polygon of Data A_1	85
Figure 4.2	Histogram and polygon of Data A_2	86
Figure 4.3	Histogram and polygon of Data B_1	87
Figure 4.4	Histogram and polygon of Data B_2	88
Figure 4.5	Histogram and polygon of Data A_1B_1	89
Figure 4.6	Histogram and polygon of Data A_2B_1	90
Figure 4.7	Histogram and polygon of Data A_1B_2	91
Figure 4.8	Histogram and polygon of Data A_2B_2	92

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Syllabus of Speaking	119
Appendix 2 Lesson Plan for Experimental Class	120
Appendix 3 Lesson Plan for Control Class	153
Appendix 4 Blueprint of Creativity	177
Appendix 5 Scoring and Grading of Creativity Test	178
Appendix 6 Creativity Test	180
Appendix 7 Readability of Creativity Test	183
Appendix 8 Blueprint and Instruments of Speaking Test.....	184
Appendix 9 Scoring Rubric of Speaking Test	185
Appendix 10 Readability of Speaking Test	186
Appendix 11 Speaking Score of Experimental Class	187
Appendix 12 Speaking Score of Control Class	188
Appendix 13 Speaking Score of Students Having High Creativity	189
Appendix 14 Speaking Score of Students Having Low Creativity	190
Appendix 15 Descriptive Statistics	191
Appendix 16 Normality Test	206
Appendix 17 Homogeneity Test	214
Appendix 18 ANOVA	215
Appendix 19 Tuckey Test	216